DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 360 236 SO 023 250

AUTHOR Bjerstedt, Ake, Ed.
TITLE Visions of Peace Education: Interviews with the Five Former Executive Secretaries of the Peace Education Commission. Educational Information Debate 99.
INSTITUTION Lund Univ. (Sweden). Malmo School of Education.
REPORT NO ISSN-0479-7736
PUB DATE 93
NOTE 49p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; International Cooperation; *International Education; *International Educational Exchange; *International Organizations; Interviews; Oral History; Professional Associations; *Role of Education
IDENTIFIERS Organizational History; *Peace Education

ABSTRACT

The Peace Education Commission (PEC), a subgroup of the IPRA (The International Peace Research Association), was established to facilitate international cooperation among individuals interested in peace education and research related to peace education. PEC is coordinated by a Council and an Executive Secretary (at present Ake Bjerstedt). The full list of former Executive Secretaries of PEC contains five persons who have served in the following order: Christoph Wulf (Germany), Magnus Haavelsrud (Norway), Robert Aspeslagh (the Netherlands), Robin Burns (Australia), and Celina Garcia (Costa Rica). The present Executive Secretary interviewed these five "predecessors" about their opinions on peace education. Present PEC members and other people interested in peace education should finding the publication interesting and stimulating. (Author/DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EDUCATIONAL INFORMATION AND DEBATE - 99

ÅKE BJERSTEDT (ED.) MSE

ED360236

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
AKE BJERSTEDT
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 023 250

Visions of peace education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1993
Published and distributed by:
Department of Educational and Psychological Research
School of Education, Box 23501
S-200 45 Malmö, Sweden

Printed by:
Graphic Systems, Malmö, Sweden

visions of peace education

Interviews with the five former executive secretaries
of the Peace Education Commission

Editor: Åke Bjerstedt

Introduction	3
Robert Aspeslagh	5
Robin Burns	14
Celina Garcia	25
Magnus Haavelsrud	32
Christoph Wulf	41

Introduction

The Peace Education Commission (PEC), a subgroup of IPRA (The International Peace Research Association), was established to facilitate international cooperation among individuals interested in peace education and research related to peace education.

Due to its character of transnational network, PEC accommodates a number of different views under continuous discussion. However, it tends to define peace education in a broad way to include both explicit peace education (dealing, for example, with facts from peace research) and implicit peace education (dealing, among other things, with how to educate a new generation to acquire peaceable values and attitudes). Members of PEC work with peace education at various educational levels (preschool, compulsory school, secondary school, higher education), as well as in the general public sector.

PEC is coordinated by a Council and an Executive Secretary (at present Åke Bjerstedt). The full list of former Executive Secretaries of PEC contains five persons who have served PEC in the following order: Christoph Wulf (Germany), Magnus Haavelsrud (Norway), Robert Aspeslagh (the Netherlands), Robin Burns (Australia), and Celina Garcia (Costa Rica).

The present Executive Secretary has interviewed these five "predecessors" about their opinions on peace education. These interviews have been carried out over a fairly long period of time. In this little publication these five interviews have been brought together (after some updating in cooperation with the interviewees). My hope is that our present PEC members and other people interested in peace education will find the reading useful and stimulating.

Å.B.

Robert Aspeslagh

1.

ÅB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

RA: I think that at the time it was a matter of luck that I entered the field of peace education. I was a primary-school teacher. I was not satisfied with my teacher training program. So one day I decided not to continue my training, and my teacher said to me: "It is a real pity, but I know a school that may be interesting for you." So he gave me an address. I entered that school – there was something happening. I said, my goodness, this I have never experienced before.

The school, I discovered, was working on the basis of the ideas of a Dutch pedagogue, Boeke, who was never mentioned in our training. Once he was put in prison for being a total conscientious objector and pacifist, a Christian anti-militarist. Thus the school was based on pacifist, non-violent anti-militaristic ideas, which were translated into pedagogy. I taught there for ten years without knowing that it was peace education that I was doing.

After ten years I decided that it was time to go away, because you should not be a teacher within the same school too long, even if you love it. Then, by chance, I saw an advertisement about a job in peace education. I applied for the job and I got it, and then I started to read and to think about peace education. My task was research and curriculum development.

When I look at my own "history", the real background may be the fact that I am a victim of war. The first years of my life were spent in a Japanese concentration camp in Indonesia. I experienced cruelty, killing and starvation as a young child. And I still experience them.

So this is how I entered this field. At the present time I have to be very modest about my practical skills in education, because it is a long time ago – about ten years – that I was an active teacher.

2.

ÅB: What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?

RA: I have difficulties in answering that question, because I know so many definitions. I need a lot of time to think about it and what to tell you about what peace education is. I don't like to give strict definitions of peace edu-

cation or talk exlusively about positive peace, negative peace and so on. I always say: A cow is a mammal, but not every mammal is a cow; so peace education is education, but not all education is peace education. You have to find *the* differences yourself. I can say: Every step people take towards peace in relation with others, with children but also with adults, due to educational influence, is peace education. It is a gradual learning process. I don't belong to the group that says: School has a structure of violence so you can't have peace education in this world. I think of peace education as a step-by-step process in education, aiming at a concept or idea of peace that people develop together.

If you would like to have some kind of definition, I would formulate it in the following way. Peace education is

A. the introduction into

- interpretations, which we acquire through the learning of knowledge and the discovering by experiences;
- varied forms of life, for which the acquisition of certain abilities, such as being self-supporting, being self-restrained, acting in sympathy with others, are necessary in order to participate in these forms of life;

B. giving direction to this on the basis of clear anthropological, political and social orientation; and

C. aiming at the creation of responsibility for and contribution to a more livable and human world society, which is non-violent and just.

3.

ÅB: If you think back of your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at "peace education"?

RA: No, when I think about my own school days, never. I never discovered that. I had personal contact with some teachers whom I really loved, because of what they were like as persons, and in that case I would say OK. But when you talk about my schooling in general I would say No. On the contrary: It was real pain, education.

4.

ÅB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?

RA: I don't think I can answer that one. I would say that it is possible that school can contribute to peace education in the system that we have, and

there are schools in the Netherlands, of course, which stem from peace-oriented educators so to speak – I'm thinking about Montessori, about Freinet, about Boeke, who was connected with the school I was in. Boeke was a very important man in promoting internationally oriented schools attached to the Associated Schools project of Unesco. He was the one who started this development in our country after World War II. So we have schools that are based on ideas of peace. But often they have lost their roots, as it were. For example, there are many Montessori schools left that have lost the ideal that they once had in peace education. I'd like to say to them: Read the books of Maria Montessori yourselves, and you'll know what peace education is.

AB: Can I interpret what you say in this way: There are a number of schools in your country that promote peace education, but they are exceptions?

RA: It depends on where you are. For example, in Amsterdam there were Social Democrats in the thirties who were very much in favor of Maria Montessori's educational ideas, and they established quite a number of public schools based on the idealism of peace and ecology characteristic of Montessori. Maria Montessori lived in the Netherlands, and her grandchildren are still living in the Netherlands; they are Dutch, because our country accepted her after she had fled from Italy and Spain because of Fascism. The Amsterdam Social Democrats belonged to the old Socialist group who had pacifist ideals. So they have built schools in Amsterdam which were designed by Maria Montessori. But now they do not seem to have any ideas about her ideals any more.

5.

ÅB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

RA: The strategy of changing or modifying schools into being more "peaceful" influences is not easy. The basic structure of schooling has to be changed. You have to develop materials, you have to develop methods. It may be useful to work with core schools very intensively for a couple of years, with the whole team of school personnel, and you have to have in-service training.

ÅB: You said you have to develop methods. What kind of methods do you have in mind?

RA: When you look at the tradition in the Netherlands, it's working with projects, open projects – not closed ones.
ÅB: How would you define an open project?
RA: Projects which are set up and decided upon in mutual agreement between teachers and pupils are open projects. It is a problem that many people working with peace education or peace work believe in projects as *The* Way. I see projects as *one* way. I also think that you can do a lot with a combination of arts and disciplines. I worked with what we called Language and Image; that is, we try to find a connection between what is written or said and the expression through arts.

Horizontal relations are important too, that is, working with no dominant or conspicuous teacher. I had no teacher's desk. We developed the curriculum and program of our school together with the pupils. I had the right as a teacher to say: I think this is important for you to know. But they also had the right to say: We like that and that and that. So there was a collaborative effort which came out of the discussions we had.
ÅB: You also said that materials development would be important. What kind of materials do you have in mind?
RA: I said it is important because there are lots of teachers whom I call indifferent. You have a group of reactionary or conservative teachers. They will never change or accept this kind of education. But then, in the middle, I think there is a big group – they are at least a very big potential – and they are good teachers. They are willing to do a lot, but they do not have an idea how to do it, because they never learned to be creative, to think for themselves. They follow their textbooks and so on, and these teachers benefit greatly from adequate materials.
ÅB: Such materials – do they exist today in your country, do you think?
RA: Yes. There are so many materials that the problem is to know what to choose.

6.
ÅB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools?
RA: Young children are also very good at making decisions etc. Of course, there are some differences, things that you can do better in older age groups than in younger ones. But on the whole I would say that the differences should not be overemphasized. Young kids like to learn too.

7.

ÅB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?

RA: Whatever the subject, I would do it very carefully, in order not to evoke negative reactions. Even if the students like football, they will react negatively if you always confront them with it. I think that "talking about peace" is not the main aim. I think it is more important to "be peace" or to be a real educator, that is to set a good example.

ÅB: Do you think that most subjects in school would be suitable for that kind of approach?

RA: No, "action learning" is also important, that is, you do something in society with your pupils in order to show them how something works. Let me give you an example. Once I said to my pupils: "Listen, I have a question for you. In the canal behind the school there are lots of fishes, but there are no frogs. How come?" And they looked at me and said: "We don't know." I said: "Are you interested in finding out?" They were, so we thought about what we had to know. - Maybe it is pollution. We had some history: history of pollution. We had some geography: we had to know about the canal and its curroundings. We needed art to make drawings. We needed some physics, because we had to measure the Ph value of the water, the clarity of the water and so on. We needed some maths to make diagrams etc. We needed language, because we had to write about it. After we had done a lot of work and a lot of research, we found the answer: The water was not polluted, but local authorities had built walls along the canal so that the frogs could not pass from water to land, so they drowned. Then we asked ourselves: Would we like to have frogs back, because that is part of nature? And our work continued with contacts with the authorities. We pulled down some walls, which raised conflicts with the authorities, and built a pond of our own. We learnt a lot of biology but especially how things are interrelated.

ÅB: How old were these pupils?

RA: They were 14 to 16.

8.

ÅB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education", and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?

RA: I have written a book on this issue – which makes it difficult to give a brief answer! You can compare the different topics which are involved. You can have a pedagogical view and look at the pedagogical ends or approaches. You can also look at the common denominators or at the differences, for example, when dealing with migrant workers. Peace education will tend to put emphasis on conflict and value differences, and will not be so very tolerant in a way – interestingly enough. Intercultural education, on the other hand, tends to accept everything as an expression of our cultures, even undemocratic behavior. Peace educators would usually not accept that. So there are differences. There are common denominators also, and this is what I have looked for.

ÅB: Have you investigated how these terms have been used historically?

RA: No, that is part of it, but it is not primary. I give some overviews of the discussions through the years. In the seventies and the beginning of the eighties we could find two approaches in Western Europe.

One is in the Federal Republic of Germany, where you see a combibination of ecology and peace, so ecology is very much part of peace education. The key word is "non-violence". Sometimes they talk about "Eko-Friedenspädagogik".

In the United Kingdom, another key may be used. If you use the key "justice", you will open the relationships between peace education, development education, intercultural education and world studies or global education.

At the time we can perceive a main change in education for peace, because of ethnic strife in Europe. The question is how we can educate for a pluralistic society on the basis of the idea of peace education. We have taken into consideration that intercultural relations cannot be disconnected from the existing framework of the community itself; they fertilize each other. Because of this starting-point, which is related to my conviction that education cannot be separated from the society and community, we are confronted with a dilemma. When we try to find overarching frameworks in our education, we still have to consider that education is also the last stronghold to preserve the cultural identity of a community, in particular in

a period of transition.

Actually, I propagate two opposing educational approaches: (a) the reinforcement of one's own framework (culture, religion etc.) and (b) the transfer of an overarching framework (the nation, human rights etc.), in which the frameworks of others are included. These two approaches show the basic problem for education and its teachers. However, the dilemma also constitutes for peace educators a fruitful source for discussion and new thought on how to operate within the dilemma.

9.

ÅB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you anticipate any difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?

RA: The main problem is political. The accusations of the conservatives have sometimes been quite severe. When you ask: "Do you see a way out of such problems?", I would say yes, just continue. Develop your own thoughts in your own way, and don't defend yourself, because there is no need for that. You don't convert these conservatives, because they feel threatened by peace education. The only thing you can do is to do your job as well as possible and to convert the indifferent people.

ÅB: But would there be problems with parents who are not so convinced and might be misled by the qeneral discussion?

RA: My old school was very progressive – it had no state examination, for example, because we felt that examination is not a good educational aim. We worked in a way that many parents did not like, because they were used to the traditional school. What happened when they came and saw the school? They were really upset sometimes. They might say: "This is chaos." But they did not take their child out of school, because the child was happy there, and a good parent never takes a kid away from where it is happy. So when peace education is really working well, I think we will have an education that the children enjoy and that the parents accept, even if they do not agree.

10.

ÅB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

RA: There is so much to do. In teacher training, let the student teachers first learn what has been said by the pedagogues about peace education. Let them listen to the peace talks of Maria Montessori and Freire, for example. What we have to develop first is what could be called a pedagogy of peace, showing how pedagogues have contributed through the centuries to peace-related education, non-violent education, education different from "die schwarze Pädagogik".

11.

ÅB: Is there anything else that you would like to add about the school and peace education?

RA: It should be remembered that so far we have different notions about peace education. In a way I would say there is no peace education, but there are a lot of different types of peace education. And I think that we have to be very careful about our own thoughts and ideals about peace education, because we adapt them to our particular situation and they might not fit into other situations. For the Netherlands, I think that the kind of peace education we have now is a necessity in a world of violence and in the European situation. But the peace education we have in the Netherlands might be a luxury in Zambia, because their primary needs are not the same. We need an open dialogue among peace educators from different countries and different hemispheres.

SOME NOTES ON THE INTERVIEWEE

Robert Aspeslagh. Born in Indonesia in 1940. Taught history and geography at secondary school level, 1965-1975. Has worked as a peace educator since 1975. Address: Nederlands Instituut voor Internationale Betrekkingen (Netherlands Institute of International Relations), Clingendael 7, 2597 VH 's-Gravenhage, Nederland. Served as Executive Secretary of the Peace Education Commission, IPRA, 1979-1983.

Examples of publications:

Basic needs and peace education. *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*, 1979, *10*(4), 403-406.

The child and the world: Conceptual background to peace education in the Netherlands. *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*, 1981, *12*, 179-189.

(With V. Wiese.) Recent discussions on disarmament education. In: Haavelsrud, M. (Ed.) *Approaching disarmament education*. Guildford, Engl.: Westbury House, 1981. Pp. 1-7.

(With R. Burns.) Concepts of peace education: A view of Western experience. *International Review of Education*, 1983, *29*, 311-330.

Structures of violence in daily life and means to overcome them. *Gandhi Marg* (New Delhi), 1984, *6*(4-5), 224-236.

(With R. Burns.) 'Objectivity', values and opinions in the transmission of knowledge for peace. *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*, 1984, *15*(2), 139-148.

(With L. Vriens.) Peace education: Alternating between the person and structures. *Gandhi Marg* (New Delhi), 1984, *6*(4-5), 313-330.

Peace education. In: *World encyclopedia of peace*. Vol. 2. Oxford: Pergamon, 1986. Pp. 182-190.

The nuclear issue in Dutch history textbooks. Paper, IPRA Conference, University of Sussex, 1986.

International cultural education; A methodological approach of education for peace: Backgrounds and objectives. The case of a cooperation between the Netherlands and Hungary. Paper, IPRA Conference, Rio de Janeiro, 1988.

(With D. Chitoran and A. Nastase.) *Pax et libertas civium: The role of universities. A survey of educational and research programmes of universities and research institutes in the Europe region devoted to international understanding, co-operation, peace and respect for human rights*. Bucharest, Romania: European Centre for Higher Education, 1989.

Tragic pages: How the GDR, FRG and Japan processed their war history – Lessons for education for peace. *Peace Education Miniprints* (Malmö, Sweden: School of Education), No. 39, 1992.

Robin Burns

1.

ÅB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

RB: My background is in development education from the late 60s onwards and particularly through the organization World University Service. As part of that in 1974 I was doing a survey for the Food and Agricultural Organization program. At a conference I met Robin Richardson and Christoph Wulf who then were in charge of the Peace Education Commission of IPRA (International Peace Research Association). They told me about it, and they invited me to correspond with the Peace Education Commission. Finally in 1976 I came to Stockholm to work with Stig Lindholm and then in 1978 came to my first IPRA summer school. Since then I have been involved in work on the relationship between peace and development education.

2.

ÅB: What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?

RB: The first thing I think of is good education: that peace education implies a commitment not only to a certain educational content but to a pedagogy as well that gives teachers and students alike an opportunity to practice some of the skills and some of the values that peace education is concerned about transmitting.

ÅB: When you talk about specific skills that peace education should develop, what would you think of?

RB: I think very quickly of the ability to make a critique of the present social order and some of its structures – from the national to the global arena – that I think are anti-peace. Children and adults need the ability to analyze the situation they are in, to reflect on that and to attempt to put some of their insights into practice as a basis then for new reflections.

ÅB: So you would see peace education as involved in both some kind of content and in the development of skills, attitudes and preparedness for action?

RB: Yes.

3.
ÅB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at "peace education"?
RB: No, I think it was intensely violent at least at one level. It was a private girls' school dominated by rules and structures. Obedience and conformity were major virtues, with a combination of concern to make us 'young ladies' and a fostering of school spirit that had elements of militarism. And over all that a middle-of-the-road Christianity.
ÅB: You went to school in Australia?
RB: Yes.

4.
ÅB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?
RB: Formally, peace education has got into some schools in some places. It is difficult to generalize because Australia has six states, and each state has its own system. There is also an extensive double system of private schools: Catholic schools and independent private schools (some Protestant, some not) that cater for up to one-third of all secondary pupils. Thus, some states, most notably Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia in the 1980s, officially supported peace education in the state school systems. Victoria funded a resource centre with one secondary and one primary teacher to work with all the schools in the state. South and Western Australia funded limited curriculum projects, as did New South Wales (NSW) until there was a change to a conservative state government which prevented the finalisation of the project. Voluntary groups continue to develop materials for schools. There was also a significant curriculum project in the 1980s between the national Curriculum Development Centre, the Victorian Catholic Education Office, and the NSW state Department of Education. National and state teacher unions also promoted peace education in the 1980s and provided materials and inservice activities. And of course there has been individual teacher effort.

Overall, however, if the school culture and environment as well as the curriculum is taken into account, one could probably say that only the Friends (Quaker) School in Tasmania is really a 'peace school'. Some schools, for example under the Catholic 'Justice and Peace' umbrella, have recognised the need to plan all their activities through such principles and have achieved a great deal in context and content. If one asked, however,

what percentage of Australian school children have been reached by peace education in the last two decades, one would have to say, only a tiny percent has.

5.

ÅB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

RB: I don't believe that schools can do very much – in the most profound sense – but I think they should nevertheless discuss the issue. They need to reflect on types of knowledge that they select for transmission. History is a good example where war knowledge and values rather than peace values can very easily become the dominant ones. I am tempted to bring out a lot of 1970s and 1980s 'new' sociology of education which critiques the function of schools to reproduce a social order which is structurally unjust, and the fact that schools have done little to change the situation of the poor, or to contribute to decreasing discrimination and violence.

This does not excuse schools from trying. Firstly, I am increasingly convinced that schools can make a positive contribution to a child's self-esteem and attitudes they hold towards others: the sort of developmental work, materials and topics chosen especially in the primary school can contribute to attitudes and skills which are 'peace-friendly'. And secondly, through the choice of content and the careful selection of texts and other materials, schools can transmit knowledge, and do so in particular ways which enable students to develop critical awareness of peace issues and possibilities. Finally, schools through the ways in which they teach young people, the structures and processes within the school can foster an appreciation of a non-violent, co-operative and more tolerant society. It is difficult for schools, which are dependent on the wider culture and subcultures, but this is not an excuse for inaction.

ÅB: When you say you would like the schools to try could you give some illustrations of what you have in mind?

RB: Firstly I do not believe that we should have a new subject called Peace Studies. I think it must be a perspective across the curriculum and for this you need educators to help teachers to integrate peace issues, peace-related discussions and peace activities within the normal curricula. The teachers need new knowledge in some subjects – on issues in physical science, for example. But especially, they need encouragement to try new methods and

training in handling controversial issues in the classroom and in using working methods that stress cooperation rather than individual competition and assessment. Learning democratic decision-making is to me part of peace education and this needs to be integrated in the school. It's very hard to have three lessons a week with this perspective and the rest of the school completely out of touch with this approach.

ÅB: Would there be some specific kind of teaching materials that you think would have to be developed?

RB: Yes, although teachers have been fairly good at finding and developing resources. We are generally working within a school based curriculum development framework in Australia, so that each school and in many instances each teacher selects their own materials, and there has been some resistance to centrally-delivered curriculum. There have also been conservative accusations of dangerous bias in peace education. Good curriculum guidelines and annotated bibliographies and resource guides can only be encouraged. In-servicing of teachers to work with the materials would also be important, yet the number of days teachers are allowed to undertake such activities is being reduced, while demands on them to master new areas and skills increase.

ÅB: Is there some specific Australian publication dealing with these things – a book on peace education in general – that you could recommend?

RB: I am trying to write one. No there is not.

6.

ÅB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools?

RB: My first reaction to this question is that it implies a fairly strict developmental approach to children's learning and I have some difficulties with the implications of Piaget's approach to this on the one hand, as well as Kohlberg's approach and the inherent sexual bias especially in his stages of moral development, on the other.

Obviously, there are different types of activities and issues which are suited to different ages. Complex issues of international relationships cannot be taught as such to six-year-olds, but the assumption that they can only learn about their immediate environment is also inadequate, as research by the Stohls and others in the early 1980s has shown. Another mistake perhaps that we make is to emphasise activities with younger children and cognitive learning and skills with older ones – both need fostering at all ages.

Complexity is a major concern. Again obviously, there are limits to the use of complex materials and ideas with young children, and I believe it is important to see the inter-relatedness of peace with issues of violence, injustice, poverty, racism, sexism, human rights, ecology and worldviews. Peace education can be an unfolding – from a basis which focuses young children on their attitudes and behaviour in a social context, and on experiential learning of some apparently abstract concepts like 'fairness' and 'co-operation', through all their learnings in the formal educational setting. It is also a challenge to our orthodox disciplinary-based teaching – we rarely get the chance to put different perspectives on an issue together. This is not an argument for an interdisciplinary subject labelled peace studies, but a question to curriculum makers, and a challenge especially to go beyond the social sciences and humanities as the only place where peace perspectives can be included: what about science, technology, physical education, even mathematics?

7.

ÅB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?

RB: My academic background is in psychology and social anthropology, and I am really not familiar with any of the more common school subjects.

ÅB: Would there be something in psychology that you would think would be relevant for a peace education?

RB: Yes, and this is seen in the two major aspects of the work of groups like Psychologists for the Prevention of War. They have been concerned with children's coping skills as they face the future, including the nuclear future though this work has largely been with individuals. They have moved toward a concern with conflict resolution and the teaching of co-operation and negotiation skills, which can make an important contribution to peacemaking. And your own and your colleagues work on the nature of worldmindedness and how it can be taught is another important contribution from psychology. What is perhaps interesting is that we gain very little from most psychological theories which tend to stress individual behaviour and dysfunction, without placing these in a social context. In fact, they tend to assume that aggression is 'normal', at least for males. There is some very interesting work now from feminist psychologists which has I

believe direct implications for peace education. They are pointing out the way we take an individual's interaction with the social and cultural context into account in understanding behaviour. They also critique the white, middle class, often male experience which is the basis for theorising about normal human behaviour, leading for example to Gilligan's work on male fear of close relationships and women's fear of separation as key themes in moral reasoning. This has immense implications for socialisation, and peace education is a part of that process.

8.

ÅB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education", and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?

RB: I have some problems, having moved from development education to peace education and having used various terms in my own studies. I am working towards a broad concept of social and political education oriented towards critical world issues. It is important to emphasize the interrelations of critical world problems, of which peace is an important example, but which must also include development and underdevelopment, justice, the environment etc.

When talking about global issues with teachers, their reaction is often: It is fine to talk about peace education, but the basic problem in my school is violence on the playground, and this violence comes from poverty and is often directed around newly arrived immigrants. So in that situation, it is useful to begin with the reality of the classroom and the playground and discuss the implications of the multi-cultural society. But it is very short-sighted if we do not add an international perspective. It is important to see that the situation of immigrants in Australia has something to do with the relations between nations.

I'm not even sure that peace education is the broadest concept. A current (early 1990s) phrase is 'ecologically sustainable future'. If we pull that apart and look at the components and interactions, we may find all the bits – from development and human rights to peace, disarmament and international understanding. Each term has tended to develop in particular contexts, and to be used in different ways by different users so that it is all very confusing. A new summary term may be called for at this point.

9.

ÅB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you anticipate any difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?

RB: Yes, there are such problems. This is partly in response to world events and Australia's relations to the United States. Particularly after the New Zealand government refused to accept even potentially nuclear armed ships in its ports, there was a lot of emphasis on the importance of the American alliance, and surveys have shown that support for that alliance has increased in our area. Some people feel that peace education is a threat to this alliance. The conservatives got hold of the debate in Britain in the 1980s and immediately started making people in Australia afraid via articles in newpapers and all sorts of places, challenging anyone in peace education, almost calling them traitors, and accused them of indoctrinating children.

ÅB: Do you think that parents would also be influenced by this discussion?

RB: They are influenced. When it's explained to them they are not so worried, however. The experience of many of the teachers I have worked with is that when you say, that you want to talk about peace education in school, parents are often upset and worried. But when you sit down and discuss what that means, then you often get a much more positive response.

In 1977 a very old regulation that said that teachers should not raise controversial political or religious issues in the classroom was changed. It is now rather seen as an obligation of teachers to treat such issues so long as they present a range of views and are not trying to indoctrinate the children. I think that students should be encouraged to debate different points of view. That is good education.

ÅB: Are there any official texts recommending peace education in the schools?

RB: There is no national statement. In the state of Victoria, a Ministerial Statement from the Minister of Education in 1984 specifically listed issues of war and peace as one of the obligations for the schools to address.

ÅB: Would other states have similar texts?

RB: No, Victoria went further than the other states, partly because of a special relationship for a period with the teacher unions. In the 1990s, issues of the economy and unemployment are so dominant and the schools are

expected to give these such a high priority that peace education has been let slip by all but the dedicated. Another way in which new support is coming is through a national curriculum development unit. The way it operates is severely limited by the states. For example, at least two states must give a high priority rating to the things they want done. They are working on some useful materials. If they are requested they can respond with projects and materials, but not with policy statements.

ÅB: What do you call this unit?

RB: The Curriculum Development Centre. It was set up by the previous Labor government in 1973. When the Liberals came back in, they abolished it, but it has been reorganized again and brought into being again.

ÅB: Where is that situated?

RB: In Canberra. It is part of the Federal Department of Education.

10 .

ÅB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

RB: That is hard work! The unions complained that not enough was done in the mid-1980s to support their work, though they weren't all that co-operative with the institutions that were doing something. Peace education has, like every 'social' topic not specifically included in a discipline, been at best available as an elective part of teacher education at both pre- and in-service levels. By 1989 there were probably 10 teacher training institutions with such an elective – I'd doubt that there were more than 3 or 4 now, at most.

ÅB: Are they for teachers who already have finished their basic training?

RB: Both were included... and pedagogy as well. I chose to work mainly at the inservice level, while offering an elective for those in their basic training. The latter seemed to be so concerned with classroom management issues that only a few felt able to take part in more general courses, and in 10 hours it wasn't possible to do much! Re-thinking key elements of teacher education is overdue in Australia – we've had numerous reviews in recent years but there has been no systematic change.

ÅB: What would be some of the things that you feel are most important to take up with teachers when they come to your course?

RB: Unfortunately, that is now an academic question as I have not had sufficient numbers of students to be able to teach my course (minimum required is 6) since 1987! Where I get an opportunity to introduce what I

now call 'contemporary world issues' I begin with a futures exercise to raise issues, and also to delve into the assumptions which we make about the future and some ways of working with these.

One of the first things I used to do in my course was to find out their interests in the subject and then to try and see how much knowledge that they have of some of the substantive issues. Do they know some of the relevant terminology? What are their conceptions of various issues? What needs to be done depends on these starting-points.

It is also very important to communicate to teachers the whole question of how the knowledge for the curricula is selected, organized and transmitted. Where do they have free space to make their own selection? On what basis do they decide what they'll do, for example, study this topic or that topic? It is essential to get them to reflect on the process of selecting topics. We should help teachers to realize the implications of their choice.

11.

ÅB: Is there anything else that you would like to add about the school and peace education?

RB: There are of course many practical issues which continue to be important. Two of these involve the special subject/curriculum perspective debate, which is perhaps less pertinent in the 1990s since the special subject is even less likely to be introduced, and also the question of resources. I've always been wary of kits which leave little room for application to the particular context, but perhaps have become more concerned about the provision of accurate and stimulating resources which enable teachers and pupils to make connections between issues. We are living in a stage when there is so much pressure on teachers, and so much is expected from education with so little resources. So good materials, and particularly good critical resource guides which enable teachers to select and choose without having to find out about the peculiarities of many different agencies all pushing their wares, are essential. I'd still emphasise the development of resourcefulness and critical skills too – I used to ask students where they would go for information, for example, on a particular social movement. They all said: Friends or organizations. Not one of them suggested going to a library, or asking other teachers or university department or centres. Both information and ideas on how to use are very important.

And as a postscript, I'd add that I have become more convinced that we need to start with 'local' issues, not just in the geographic sense but with the

development of personal skills and attitudes. However, I refuse to accede to what is becoming a popular view, at least in a form of journalism around at the moment which focuses on the 'odd' views of my generation, and that is to see concern with structural reform as outdated. We need change – some would add cultural transformation – more than ever. Changed individuals are part of this, but so is political action!

SOME NOTES ON THE INTERVIEWEE

Robin Joan Burns, Ph.D., senior lecturer in comparative and international studies in education at the School of Education, La Trobe University, Bundoora, Victoria, Australia. Executive committee member, Peace Education Committee (PEC), 1979-1988 and Executive Secretary of PEC, 1983-1988.

Her main professional interests include higher education policy, the sociology of knowledge, women's socialisation and identity, and public health especially women's health.

Examples of publications:

The formation and legitimation of development education with particular reference to Australia and Sweden. (Unpubl. Ph.D. thesis.) Melbourne: La Trobe University, 1979.

Can we educate for disarmament in the present world order? In: Haavelsrud, M. (Ed.) *Approaching disarmament education.* Guildford, Surrey, Engl.: Westbury House, 1981. Pp. 28-51.

Continuity and change in peace education. *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*, 1981, 2, 115-123.

Problems of legitimation of peace education. In: Jahn, E. & Sakamoto, Y. (Eds.) *Elements of world instability.* Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 1981. Pp. 345-354.

Development education and peace education: From conflict to cooperation. (UNICEF Development Education Paper, No. 22.) New York: UNICEF, 1982.

(With R. Aspeslagh.) Concepts of peace education: A view of Western experience. *International Review of Education*, 1983, *29*, 311-330.

Blinded by the flash: A fairy story for a nuclear age. *Gandhi Marg* (New Delhi), 1984, *6*, 418-432.

(With R. Aspeslagh.) 'Objectivity', values and opinions in the transmission of knowledge for peace. *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*, 1984, *15*, 139-148.

Peace education: Is it responding sufficiently to children's fears of the future? *Australian Journal of Early Childhood*, 1985, *10*(4), 16-23.

Teachers and peace education in Australia: Whose task? In: Alger, C. & Balazs, J. (Eds.) *Conflict and crisis of international order*. Budapest: Centre for Peace Research Coordination of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, 1985. Pp. 467-476.

Conflict and mass destruction: A content analysis of Australian involvement in World War II in history textbooks in Victoria. Paper presented for the IPRA Conference, Brighton, Sussex, 1986.

Women, science education and action for peace. In: Alger, C. & Stohl, M. (Eds.) *A just peace through transformation*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1988. Pp. 190-210.

(With Toh Swee-Hin) Educating for peace: the Australian experience. *Convergence*, 1989, *22*(1), 61-74.

Peace education and global cultural transformation. In: Bretherton, D. et al. (Comps.) *Australian and New Zealand peace studies curriculum guide*. Melbourne: Victorian Association for Peace Studies, 1989. Pp. 36-46.

Discovering peace education. In: Toh, S.H. (Ed.) *Journeys in peace education: Critical reflections from Australia*. Sans Souci, NSW: EARTH, 1990. Pp. 33-56.

Some basic requirements for educating for peace. *Interdisciplinary Peace Research*, 1990, *2*(1), 65-82.

Celina Garcia

1.

AB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

CG: I am Celina Garcia from Costa Rica. I come from what is perhaps a unique country in the world - a disarmed country. I don't know of any other modern democratic country in the Western hemisphere where peace is a government institution; where people would never fear war. The emphasis in our country has always been on education. It seems difficult for people outside our country to imagine what it's like in a country where there is no army. The army was abolished in 1949 symbolically, because there had never been any strong institutionalized military force.

For me, peace education is a very natural way of thinking. However, in Costa Rica, peace education doesn't exist as a separate subject. Whether we are peaceful because of our education or in spite of our education might be discussed. But at least, the culture of "civilism" – the culture of living as civilians – has been very strong in our country. It's important, I think, for people in the peace movement to know that there is a small, modern country in Latin America without an army in the midst of a part of the world characterized by oppression and militarism.

AB: What could be some of the historical reasons for this?

CG: It always seems easy to explain what has happened after the fact, but who could predict history? But historically, we were very poor, and I think poverty helped to save us from the rape of the Europeans. The country was inhabited by very few Indians – I think there were about 27,000 Indians when the Spanish arrived, and they made sure to kill many of them, or many of them died as a consequence of civilization, which is one of my favourite expressions from Freire. Now only very few remain in the mountains.

But in general, there is a homogeneous ethnic background. We never had clashes of cultures as in many other countries. There were never clashes of religion. Since the people who founded Costa Rica were very poor farmers from Spain, nobody really paid any attention to us, which saved our lives. We were able to develop ourselves, practically isolated, very individualistically, with a very personal kind of culture, and with great respect for other people's ideas and political views. The country enriched itself with persecuted political refugees from outside. The people who found a home of

freedom in Costa Rica enriched our educational and political life enormously.

Our first president was a teacher, and that is very meaningful to our history. I would say: If there is something important in our history, the fact that our first president was a teacher, behaved like a teacher, talked like a teacher and acted like a teacher was very, very important.

ÅB: What about your own background and interest in the area of peace education?

CG: I'm a philosopher by undergraduate education, and then I studied sociology in the United States. I lived and worked in New York for about 15 years – this is why I have a horrible New York accent. When I lived in New York, I worked a lot in the slums – in Harlem. At the time, there was a federal program that was to fund community programs. Cities who had a lot of racial problems received money for work in inner-city neighborhoods. I worked with programs for parents of Spanish and Latin American background, particularly with people from Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic and Cuba.

I think that this work is related to my interest in work for justice and peace. Meeting Quakers was very important, and also meeting many people who at that time were working in the peace movement because of the Vietnam war. I had a very close friend Roger Woock – who now lives in Australia; he had done a Ph.D. thesis on peace education, and that attracted my interest. He is a professor in Australia right now. So meeting Roger and his wife at the time (they are divorced now) and many of the people who were deeply interested in the peace movement was important to my own development.

I heard about IPRA in the late 70s, and I began to do some research in IPRA. Then I have done teacher training in peace education in Costa Rica, and I have worked for the University for Peace.

2.

ÅB: What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?

CG: Total social transformation, total social revolution that is peaceful, nonviolent, but a total transformation. I don't believe in reformations. I think habits of violent solutions are very deeply ingrained in our persons, in our families, and in our social structures, so at least we need to try to bring about a radical transformation. When I think about peace education, I think about total transformation. I don't have all the answers on how to do this,

but this is my image and ambition.

3.
ÅB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at "peace education"?
CG: I was very fortunate to be my mother's daughter. My mother was my teacher in the 5th and 6th grade, and she was also the school principal after that. My mother was a definite influence. She was a very outspoken woman for human rights, for women's rights. At that time, I think she was considered very revolutionary (as were other female members of our family – one of them was the second woman who got a driver's licence, and she was thrown out of the town). My mother was a very strong and very literate woman. She was able to distinguish right from wrong immediately, and I think that, to me, is an important part of peace education: to be able to make a decision based on value priorities when you have two or more options.
ÅB: Besides this influence from your mother, were there some aspects that you would call peace education in your school?
CG: It's very difficult to distinguish what is peace education in a country that is peaceful. There was a lot of freedom, and to me that is peace. We may not have peace research theory or specific peace education elements. What we do is *live it*. If you invest the budget of your country in education, in public health, in helping the poor, to me this is living peace education. I'm not saying we are perfect, but we don't use our money to feed a military elite or to have military schools or expensive arms; instead we choose to use that money for public service, such as roads and telephones.

4.
ÅB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?
CG: There has been a law through which human rights are going to be taught in all grammar schools. There is always an emphasis on teaching special things that have to do with freedom and rights, civil rights, political rights, human rights. In that way: Yes.
ÅB: But there is no direct recommendation that you should deal with peace education?
CG: Yes, there is at this moment. There are recommendations to use peace education, and we have to be careful to follow that up in various areas of education. There is a need to make a revision of school texts, for there is

sexism. But this is a constant thing going on in Costa Rica. We are never really satisfied with what we have, so we try to improve the level of education. If we had traditional books, where some war heroes were very emphasized – well, I'm sure there is somebody looking into that. There is a constant revision.

5.

AB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

CG: Definitely yes, schools could do it. But, I think, first we should be very careful to get rid of all our pre-conceptions of what education means. For me, peace education – as I said before – is a total transformation, and we should begin to transform ourselves, to leave behind all the patterns of sexism and racism, to leave the patterns of making a division between those who have our type of education and those who don't have type of our education. I think we should come down from our pedestal of self-glorifying knowledge that separates us from those wrongfully called illiterate. When we build up an education that is acceptable to all of us, as a human family, to me that would be the first steps towards peace education. And I think maybe Costa Rica would be an example of a country that would do it. Maybe in the next 25 years, we may have gained a lot in many areas: liberating ourselves from sexism that's a great step; liberating ourselves from racism; and establishing some kind of an education that is more adapted to the needs of our century, taking care of the environment too.

6.

AB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools?

CG: It's known that smaller children learn more by games, by role-playing and by theatre. We all benefit from that, too, but I think as they grow a little older, you can use more of the boring theory, whereas when you deal with the younger grades, you can let the children have a lot of fun by role-playing, by simulation and by theatre.

AB: Has it been an issue whether or not you should deal with war, especially nuclear war, in the school?

CG: In Costa Rica we study it, but in Costa Rica the nuclear bomb is felt to be so remote. Some of the teachers that I have done training with use the

famous story of the little girl in Hiroshima, Sadako. When they use that, the kids cry and sympathize with the girl, but they cry about it in the same way they would cry about children who have lost their mother. There is no general understanding of what nuclear threat is in Costa Rica. It just doesn't sink into our minds; most people don't really understand the potential of total nuclear devastation. However, there is a great awareness in some circles. For instance, they were going to have an atomic lab at the University of Costa Rica, and they refused it. They don't want to have anything to do with nuclear energy.

7.

AB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?

CG: Let's take Central America, for instance. If I were teaching about the problems of Central America, I'd like the students to conduct the class first, to give ideas. Usually, what is easily accessible also in poor areas is newspapers and radio news. The way many teachers handle it is starting by bringing news to the classroom, and from there they can take up different activities such as making simulations, for example on human rights. The Inter-American Court for Human Rights is in Costa Rica, and they were making an investigation of the violation of human rights in Honduras, and two of the witnesses were shot before they were asked to give testimony. So I would gather all the information on that, and then I would ask one of the students if he or she wanted to be the judge: What would you do if your witnesses were shot? Do you know any other similar situation? Then we would make a simulation on this topic. Some of the students can write a dialogue, and they can have a little play around a very important subject. Some may go home and get more information. Some may have relatives in Honduras and bring us personal information. Others may bring information on the history of the violation of human rights in Honduras. So then you can have a whole book made up by the class on just one particular subject, involving the students very actively in the process.

8.

AB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have

any comments and preferences as to this terminology?

CG: They are certainly not the same, and I think they should all be used to describe the variety of approaches in our profession. You could also talk about education related to international law, for instance – that is also an important part of peace education. I like to think about peace education in terms of radical peace education. The other expressions represent different emphases that should remain separate, under what I consider the umbrella: Peace education.

ÅB: When you use the term "radical peace education", what do you primarily think about?

CG: For me radical peace education is education that is very critical of traditional education as it has been reserved for a privileged minor group.

9.

ÅB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you anticipate any difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?

CG: In Costa Rica, people want more materials, more speakers etc. in this area. That would be the only difficulty that I have met. I've never heard of parents or others who don't want it. I'm sure there are some, but I've never heard of anybody. It isn't controversial in the same way as I know it is in Europe.

10.

ÅB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

CG: In general, I think teachers need to have more training in creative ways of using non-violence within the classroom, within the school system, within the educational system. They need to be more aware that peace begins at home and home is the classroom, that the injustices done to their students is a real problem that has to be dealt with. We tend to ignore it – we are telling our students by our actions that we don't care, and then we say that we love peace, that we love disarmament – I'm talking about this now from my point of view in Costa Rica. It's very nice that we are so peace-loving generally, but when a teacher makes the choice of not addressing himself or herself to the needs of their students who suffer from nearby violence, sexism or

racism, there is a problem. We have to be models continuously, and we have to hold on to values. In our era we are too afraid to say: This is right and this is wrong, but we know it from our constitutions, we know it from our religions, and we know it from all the international agreements that we have signed. Applying human rights in our classrooms and caring are very important. I think we should develop a new teacher with ability to display sensitivity and support.

11.

ÅB: Is there anything else that you would like to add about the school and peace education?

CG: Those of us who work on peace education in different countries should establish networks of support. Nowadays we have, for example, video-cassettes that we could exchange, so that we can really begin demonstrating peace education in a more concrete kind of way. Some of us who work in peace education are rather isolated from each other, and sometimes we say: Oh, my God, is anybody listening? So I feel that we need international support, too. I hope that we will begin to tell each other what we are doing in a more personal way.

SOME NOTES ON THE INTERVIEWEE

Celina Garcia was the Executive Secretary of PEC (the Peace Education Commission of the International Peace Research Association) from August 1988 to July 1990. (This interview was carried out in Rio de Janeiro, August 1988.)

Among other things, she has been interested in sex roles (Androgyny and peace education. *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*, 1981, *12*, 163-171.) and in procedures for conflict resolution (being responsible for a Spanish version of "The Friendly Classroom for a Small Planet").

Address: P.O. Box 8-4820, San José, Costa Rica.

Magnus Haavelsrud

1.

ÅB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

MH: When I was going to write a paper on pedagogy at the University of Oslo in 1965, I asked Eva Nordland if I could write about children's conceptions or war and peace. She sent me to Johan Galtung, and the upshot was my doing a study. The idea was to give a questionnaire to children in Berlin on either side of the wall, in the East and in the West. So I went there and got the permission to go ahead in West Berlin, but I was turned down in the East – the explanation was that in East Berlin all children are for peace, so there was no need to investigate it.

I had taken an interest in that area before that. I think it's associated with the experiences I had when I did my military service, when I was drafted as a soldier. I could never really come to terms with the fact that I was going in there to be trained to shoot and prepared to participate in war. But, unlike many others, I never turned pacifist, maybe because I come from an environment in our country where it wasn't customary to think along those lines – an agrarian environment, far from a city. Those were not things you talked about.

ÅB: Could you say something about what you have been doing later in connection with this problem area?

MH: I studied in the US and participated in The World Conference on Education in California in 1969, and there I met Betty Reardon, among others, in a working group. That was the beginning of The World Council for Curriculum and Instruction. The Foreign Department in Oslo paid for my trip, and it turned into an important contact for me and many other people. That meeting meant that I was involved in Betty Reardon's School Program. I then worked with a course on peace education for teachers in the US and Canada, and after that we helped to organize The World Conference on Education at the University of Keele in 1974, which was a follow-up to the California conference.

Since the network of educators working with these issues in the US and Canada was becoming increasingly international, it was organized as the "Peace Education Commission" within the "International Peace Research Association". I was appointed executive secretary of that commission in 1975.

and since then I haven't really been able to tear myself away from that type of work, because it has been so interesting.

ÅB: Are you involved at present in work within the area of peace education?

MH: Yes, I'm trying to write a historical survey. It's going to be some kind of history of science, about how the ideas of peace education arose, when they were presented and by whom, whether those ideas have survived and the foci of the discussions. I'm collaborating on this with an Italian called Mario Borrelli. We have got as far as the mid-sixties, so most of the work still remains. I think a work like that might be instructive, not only for me.

ÅB: I know that you have been working on a teacher's handbook for UNESCO. How is that coming along?

MH: Yes, that is a handbook on Disarmament Education for Teachers. But it has turned into a complicated matter. The work has been going on at the same time as the US threatened to leave UNESCO and actually did so eventually. Among other things, the US disliked UNESCO addressing issues of disarmament. We had a manuscript in progress, but UNESCO never took a serious interest in making it possible for us to finish the work process.

2.

ÅB: What do you think of first when you hear the expressions "fredsfostran" and "fredsundervisning"?

(Note: The interview was not carried out in English, but – as is natural between a Swede and a Norwegian – in both the Scandinavian languages involved; in this case questions in Swedish and answers in Norwegian. "Fredsfostran" and "fredsundervisning" can both be translated by "peace education", but they have usually different connotations, approximately "rearing/training for peace" and "peace-related instruction".)

MH: I think I prefer "fredsundervisning", and by that I refer to people's understanding of the world we live in, among other things. Consciousness-raising may be a keyword. I'm influenced by Freire's concepts of dialogue and understanding, so it's important for me to speak about both content and form and the context in which it takes place. Consequently I want to talk about a content that has not been defined in advance but that is defined by means of a dialogue among the participants. In other words, I attach great importance to the fact that the participants themselves should be involved and establish the premises for the choice of subject-matter, as well as to the fact that the subject-matter is gradually changed by means of dialogue. In this way, the experiences of the individual are expanded, and we can witness a

gradual insight into larger areas as well as an awareness of new connections.
ÅB: You said that you prefer the term "fredsundervisning". Do you also use the expression "fredsfostran" or "fredsoppdragelse"?
MH: No, I think "fredsundervisning" is the most important thing. To me, the term "fostran" implies that there's a need for change. I don't have the impression that children experience the need for becoming something different from what they are as far as issues of peace are concerned. Nor do I have the urge to change children. The fact that children become bellicose – I think that's a question of preventing things from happening to children rather than changing the children. So I don't think changing people is the main point.

3.
ÅB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at "peace education"?
MH: That wasn't an expression that was used in those days. Naturally we learned many good things at school, and since I include a wide content in peace education, so that it comprises such values as justice and equality and participation etc., I can see that we learned some good things associated with peace education. I think we had more opportunities to learn how to be together in a way that is not available to many children today. Maybe it wasn't so much at school that I learned that as at home, since that's where I learned to talk to other people; it was part of your daily life. You must remember that we didn't have television when I was a child. We also read books together in class, and we discussed things. – On the other hand there was a nationalistic streak in my old school, as well as a Eurocentric one, some kind of a missionary attitude, an ideology that we should go out into the world at large and teach them about our culture.

4.
ÅB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?
MH: I do think there's less nationalism today, and that there are more opportunities to show solidarity with people outside your own country, partly because communications have improved so enormously. We were extremely cut off from the rest of the world when I was at sohool (I was born in 1940). So I do believe that the school of today, as I know it, can contribute to a feeling of solidarity with totally different groups than I could

ever meet. But at the same time there are forces at school that work in the opposite direction, for example problems of ra ism and mobbing.

ÅB: You claimed that working with a dialogue and consciousness-raising are of central importance in peace education. Do you think you can discern such a process in today's school?

MH: To a certain extent, but it seems that the process continues to a certain point – but then it's stopped. There is a limit – you cannot be too critical of the life and system of Norwegian society. The dialogue is alive within certain limits, but you cannot step outside those limits. It is a national school .

If you look at textbooks, however, the content has improved enormously. They contain more material about conflict. Society is viewed as a process rather than something static that you should just learn things about. It isn't just a question of structures any more, but also of seeing the dynamics of society. That is apparent in teaching materials as well as in methodology.

5.

ÅB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

MH: Yes, but that is probably the most problematic thing of all, that the very thing that I would ideally have liked to happen to peace education, namely that the content was developed from the pupils' own interests, ideals and hopes, seems to be hard to implement at school. There seems to be a built-in idea that if you are to teach somebody something, the content must be determined in advance. This kind of prescribed instruction, which Freire calls "bank instruction", is so deeply ingrained in everyone who works at school that they are unused to conducting a dialogue that attempts to include the pupils' own subjective reactions towards the world.

This doesn't apply only to people, but also to the way the educational system is organized. The pupils are organized into classes, time is divided into specific periods and the content is organized as subjects, and the kind of dialogue that I would like is seriously impeded by those three things.

ÅB: So far, you have mainly emphasized that it's difficult or impossible to attain your ideal of a dialogue. But what should be done in order to make *some* progress? What should be changed first of all?

MH: It's important to make the pupils more active and to take part when the pre-conditions for the development of the content are laid down. In addition, the content at school should deal with the future as well as the past. We

should talk about active social changes, strategies for changing society, whether on the local, national or global level. I think we have moved a little bit in that direction. I do think we have become somewhat more dialogic.

6.

ÅB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools?

MH: It's my impression that you have the right to be dialogic at an early age, at the day-care centers. I myself have a son who goes to a day-care center, and what happens there is very good from the perspective I have described here. But the further the children proceed through the school system, the more "intellectual" the instruction has to be, the more it has to be determined what they should learn. I've heard people say that those who study at school should learn things before they can have any opinions. Such a pedagogical attitude is very dangerous. If it is systematized, it will kill people's attempts to think, to be critical. So it seems to me that what we have here is a mistaken adversarial relationship; at the day-care center you may be allowed to think for yourself, but the older you are, the more conformity is required of you. Then it has almost been determined in advance what you should think. It shouldn't be like that. Instead, the opportunities to participate in a fruitful dialogue should increase continuously.

7.

ÅB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?

MH: Take society, for example. If we were to discuss society, the way I would conduct peace education would be that I would try to find out what the pupils were interested in. Are they interested in the situation of young people in the local community or in the weapons of the world or starvation in Ethiopia? I would want to clarify the pre-conditions at the very beginning. Then the great problem is to stimulate a discussion and development of the content.

ÅB: When you talk about consciousness-raising and working with dialogue, I mainly think of the cognitive factor, getting insights into relationships, and so on. Are you also interested in affecting attitudes and creating preparedness for action?

MH: I'm very afraid of stepping outside the purely cognitive. I'm afraid of

indoctrination. I think values and attitudes change by themselves, more or less, depending on what you understand and how you have evaluated that understanding. I think I would like to give priority to the cognitive factor and hope for a change. But instruction by means of dialogue also requires special attitudes, which are often lacking. Therefore the way people can change their communication from anti-dialogue to dialogue is also dependent on their attitudes and values.

ÅB: So the way you see it is that the cognitive factor has an impact on attitudes, values and preparedness for action, but you don't want to influence anything but the cognitive directly?

MH: Yes, like Kohlberg, the American psychologist who wrote about "moral development", I think that the arguments for the moral standpoint that are the important aspect. I prefer an dialogic peace education to an indoctrinating one.

8.

ÅB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?

MH: I have never been drawn to "education for international understanding", maybe especially because I've had the impression that it's such a depoliticized concept. "Peace education", I suppose, is the term I prefer to use. In my opinion, peace education includes "disarmament education", "development education" as well as "human rights".

I don't favor "global education" either, since I'm trying to make the concept of peace as relevant on the local level as in the global perspective. The relationship between the local and the global is central in peace education. I'm primarily concerned with the cognitive element, with the good arguments in the good debate, you might say.

9.

ÅB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you anticipate any difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?

MH: The main problem is how to use some of the time at school for dia-

logue. That is beyond the concept of education that is predominant at school. When you mention it, people immediately suspect that here is someone who is going to indoctrinate someone about something, but I think this is the new kind of effort that is required in our society in order to make people more dialogue-oriented, to enhance the free exchange of ideas in school. We must ask ourselves whether school is the right place to start. We should be democratic, which means that everybody should participate, so it should really be quite simple to legitimize this way of working, and indeed it is on the theoretical level. But in practical everyday life, school is not organized according to that principle, and the lack of a school debate on that question is striking in our country.

ÅB: Is it still considered controversial in Norway to deal with questions of war and peace?

MH: Yes, since pacifism is controversial. A twelve-year-old may say: I'll never go to war, because I don't want to use weapons. Then another twelve-year-old says the same thing, and eventually the whole class agrees. That is not a totally unrealistic scenario for dialogic group activity. That would be viewed as complicated in Norway today.

ÅB: How do you think such a question should be handled, then?

MH: I think the idealism we often find in children and adolescents must also be confronted with the entire reality we are surrounded with. All the arguments that are used in our social debate should be included. If necessary, we must invite guests from outside, or other pupils at school. A comprehensive discussion is a good thing. We should deal with controversial topics the way a good journalist would. That may be a guideline for the teacher.

10.

ÅB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

MH: Future teachers must be allowed to practise developing the content in a new way: project-oriented work in developing content and in working with the local community, a dialogue which is generally more comprehensive, a greater openness. I don't think Norwegian colleges of education have done very much in that direction so far.

11.

ÅB: Is there anything else that you would like to add about the school and peace education?

MH: The international perspective is important, and by that I mean that when we discuss what we mean by the East, we should also try to find out what the East thinks of us. It's important to try to get more information from the participants directly involved in a conflict – what they really stand for. That can be used in a discussion. We often work too much with processed information, second-hand information. One single textbook read by millions of pupil is the opposite of first-hand information and dialogue.

I may sometimes have given the impression of looking at dialogue versus non-dialogue as a matter of either-or. I feel, however, that there is a continuum including many varieties.

SOME INFORMATION ABOUT THE INTERVIEWEE

Magnus Haavelsrud, born in 1940. Active at the Institute of Social Sciences, the University of Tromsø, Norway. Earned an M.A. in Political Science at the University of Oslo and a Ph. D. at the University of Washington. Served as Executive Secretary of the Peace Education Commission, the International Peace Research Association, between 1975 and 1979. Has written many articles about peace education and edited major conference publications oriented to peace education (see below).

Examples of publications:

Seminal agents in the acquisition of international orientations among adolescents. (Ph. D.) University of Washington, 1970. 194 pp. (71-00974.)

Teaching about war and peace. *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*, 1970, *1*, 381-384.

Views on war and peace among students in West Berlin public schools. *Journal of Peace Research*, 1970, *7*, 99-120.

Ansichten von Kindern and Jugendlichen über Krig und Frieden. *Bildung und Wissenschaft*, 1972, 25(3), 29-43.

Learning resources in the formation of international orientations. *Communication Review*, 1972, *20*(3), 229-251.

Raising consciousness through a global community curriculum. *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*, 1974, *5*, 274-279.

(Editor.) *Education for peace: Reflection and action*. Guildford, Surrey, Engl.: IPC Science and Technology Press, 1976.

Principles of peace education. In: Haavelsrud, M. (Ed.) *Education for peace...*, 1976. Pp. 250-268.

(Editor.) *Approaching disarmament education*. Guildford, Surrey, Engl.: Westbury House, 1981.

On the substance of disarmament education. In: Haavelsrud, M. (Ed.) *Approaching...*, 1981. Pp. 100-113.

Fredsundervisning – noen prinsippielle avveininger og valg. *Norsk pedagogisk tidskrift*, 1982, *66*, 184-197.

Thinking about the future at school. *Prospects*, 1983, *13*(1), 10-19.

(Co-editor with J. Galtung.) The debate on education for peace. /Special issue of:/ *International Review of Education*, 1983, *29*(3).

Peace education strategies in oppressive contexts. *Gandhi Marg* (New Delhi), 1984, *6*, 237-253.

Education and development towards peace. (Monograph Series A, No. 47.) Tromsø, Norway: Institute of Social Science, 1988.

(With A. Eide et al.) The impact of the arms race on education, science and technology, and culture and communication. In: *Unesco Yearbook on Peace and Conflict Studies, 1987*. Paris: Unesco, 1989. Pp. 1-173. (Contribution by M. Haavelsrud, 97-127.)

(With M. Borrelli.) *Peace education within the archipelago of peace research 1945-1964*. Tromsø, Norway: Arena, 1993.

Christoph Wulf

1.
ÅB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?
CW: My first encounter with questions of peace education was in the United States in 1970. At that time I was looking at the new Social Studies Education movement. My aim was to make a careful collection and analysis of various efforts within the program of social studies education in the United States. In this connection I met up with questions of peace education. An introductory seminar, to which I had been invited by Betty Reardon and J. Metcalf of the Institute for World Order, made a particularly deep impression on me. Inspired by that seminar, I decided to start something in this field in Germany. Through Saul Mendlovitz I made the acquaintance of Johan Galtung and Dieter Senghaas. At the congress of the International Peace Research Association in Bled in what was then Yugoslavia, we joined together to found the Peace Education Commission. With the help of the German Association for Peace and Conflict Research, which had just been formed, I drafted the program for a first congress of Critical Peace Education in Europe. This congress took place in Bad Nauheim in 1972. It was attended by about 350 delegates from 14 countries in Central and Eastern Europe, the United States, Africa and Asia. The largest group of delegates was made up of teachers and social scientists from the Federal Republic of Germany who were concerned with these questions.

There is no doubt that from that point in time one could speak of a Critical Peace Education activity in Germany. Major themes were: the East-West conflict, the North-South conflict, and environmental pollution.

2.
ÅB:What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?
CW: It is my opinion that these constellations of conflict are still central matters of concern in peace education. As I see it, peace education includes both the work with a negative peace concept and the efforts to realize a positive peace concept. To this should be added the efforts within society to bring social justice into being. This also involves tolerant socializing with other people in such a way as to respect their own individual differences while avoiding subjecting these differences to one's own frame of reference and interpretation. Seen in this way, peace education is also education for

tolerance and acceptance in one's dealings with the other person.

3.
If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at "peace education"?
CW: In my schooldays, which I finished in 1963, questions of peace education, of the East-West conflict, of the North-South conflict or of environmental protection were not yet being considered. It was not until the students' movement of 1968 that any great interest in these problems developed.

4.
ÅB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?
CW: The extent to which schools in the Federal Republic of Germany contribute to peace education depends on the teachers working in those schools. For many, questions of peace education are still important. Themes given a central position in schools include particularly the problems of environmental protection and the difficulties in co-existence with minority groups.

5.
ÅB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?
CW: In my view, peace education in schools is possible and necessary. For one thing, it can be a teaching principle that is important in all school subjects, containing as it does perspectives and criteria, to the realization of which the total educational activity in schools must contribute. Peace education can also bear fruit through intensive work on attitudes and values and by providing basic knowledge in the relevant areas. Finally, if the structures of violence found in the school itself are turned into themes for discussion this may help to clarify the experiences of school and to enrich the lives of the students.

6.
ÅB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools?

CW: Up to the end of the 1980s the peace movement and its green counterpart gained more and more importance in the Federal Republic of Germany. One aspect of these two movements that has influenced the attitudes of school students is the way in which the movements have gained in importance in society at large, outside school. At present, questions of disarmament have receded into the background. Environmental pollution, by contrast, is a matter of grave concern for people in general and it attracts the attention of children and school students. Within society, increasing attention is being demanded by the conflicts and acts of violence that are coming to the fore in the wake of the aimlessness of many young people after the collapse of the German Democratic Republic.

7.
ÅB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?
CW: In my view, questions of violence, social justice and peace can play a central role in almost all school subjects. One notes, however, that both teachers and students often fail to realize the full value of these themes. In my opinion, peace education is a central dimension of every kind of education and has lost nothing of its urgency.

8.
ÅB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?
CW: The concept of "education for disarmament" is too narrow for me. Peace education covers more than arms reduction. By contrast to this, I prize the concepts of "global education" and "international education". The concept of "global education" indicates the common task of all nations in maintaining and forming the world. A similar thought is found in the concept of "international education". This concept, which has been chiefly propagated by Unesco, focusses on the need for international understanding and international co-operation. What appeals to me in the concept of peace education is its critical dimension, which is chiefly provided by reference to a positive concept of peace with the aim of producing social justice in all

human concerns.

9.
ÅB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you anticipate any difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?
CW: It is also the case in Germany that the concepts of "peace education" and "education for disarmament" have met with much emotional resistance. For this reason it may be more fruitful to find some other conceptualization of the themes and aims subsumed under this concept. What is decisive is not which concept we select in detail, but that we communicate the goals and contents, the values and standards of peace education. In the Federal Republic of Germany many problems which attract attention under the concept of peace education may be treated in the sphere of political education. Seen in this way, political education is peace education.

10.
ÅB:What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?
CW: Many teachers of history and social studies need to be given a much deeper acquaintance with the themes, contents, methods and aims treated under the concept of peace education. In addition, much is to be said for bringing themes of peace education into the training of teachers within the general area of educational sciences and treating them there. Here, much more should be done than at present.

11.
ÅB: In many schools, the students represent a variety of nationalities and cultural backgrounds. To what extent would it be possible to use this fact as an aid in education for peace? Would you expect some difficulties in doing so?
CW: In multicultural school student groups, there is no doubt of the importance of questions concerning the other person: acceptance of differences, and awareness of the non-understandability of the stranger, are important themes for education. An appropriate response to the stranger can only be brought about by reflecting over the limited understandability

of the other person and of one's own culture. In this, values such as social justice, non-violence and tolerance play an important role. In Europe, the process of rubbing shoulders with strangers and with representatives of other cultures will play an increasingly important role – all the more so as the migratory movements gather force.

12.
ÅB: Sometimes the term "global survival" is used to refer to an area dealing both with the risks of nuclear war and with the risks of far-reaching environmental damage through pollution and overuse of resources. How do you look upon dealing with these two categories of risks together in school? Do you have any suggestions as to how the teacher could approach the problem area of environmental damage?
CW: As already suggested, it appears to me that the consideration of the problem of environmental pollution is a task of education in general. It cannot be restricted to individual subjects but belongs to the educational mandate of schools today. Nonetheless, the questions covering the contents of this theme, concerned with the future of world society and of the planet, have their place in many fields of the curriculum. Failure to treat these in school would represent a neglect of an important educational task.

13.
ÅB: Is there anything else that you would like to add about the school and peace education?
CW: The concept of "peace education" may be expressed in various themes; each of these has its aims, contents, and experiences which are relevant to action, and as I see it these should form part of present-day education both inside school and outside it. However, for these themes to be treated and to gain their effect it is not necessary to keep on subsuming them all under the concept of "peace education". The greatest effect of peace education is obtained when its aims and values influence all spheres of education.

Note: A German version of this interview (which is the original one) is presented in: Wulf, C. & Projekt Friedensbereitschaft. Friedenserziehung: Ein Interview. *Didakometrie und Soziometrie* (Malmö, Schweden: Lehrerhochschule), Nr 39, 1993.

SOME NOTES ON THE INTERVIEWEE

Christoph Wulf, born 1944 in Berlin. Studied education, philosophy, history and literature in Berlin, Marburg, Paris and the United States. MA, Freie Universität Berlin, 1968; Dr. phil., Philipps Universität, Marburg, 1973; Dr. habil., 1975. Senior Researcher, German Institute for International Educational Research, Frankfurt, 1970-1975. Professor of Education, Universität/Gesamthochschule Siegen, 1975-1979. Professor of General and Comparative Education, Freie Universität Berlin, from 1980; co-director of the Research Centre for Historical Anthropology from 1988. Office address: Freie Universität Berlin, FB Erziehungs- u. Unterrichtswissenschaften, Habelschwerdter Allee 45, 1000 Berlin 33.

Examples of publications:

Auf dem Wege zu einer transnationalen Friedenserziehung. *Bildung und Erziehung*, 1972, *25*(5), 58-65.

(Editor.) *Friedenserziehung in der Diskussion*. München: Piper, 1973.

(Editor.) *Kritische Friedenserziehung*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1973. (2. Aufl. 1982.)

(Editor.) Schwerpunkt: Friedenserziehung. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik*, 1973, *19*(2).

(Editor.) Special issue on peace education. *International Peace Research Newsletter*, 1973, *11*(1-2).

(Editor.) *Handbook on peace education*. Frankfurt/M.: International Peace Research Association (Education Committee), 1974.

Schule als Lern- und Sozialisationsfeld für Friedenserziehung. In: Internationales Institut für den Frieden (Ed.) *Wissenschaft und Frieden*, 1974. Pp. 3-12.

(Editor.) Special issue on peace education. *International Peace Research Newsletter*, 1974, *12* (fall issue).

Peace education. *Transnational Perspectives*, 1976, *3*(3/4), 34-38.

Perspektiven Kritischer Friedenserziehung. In: Internationales Institut für den Frieden (Ed.) *Wissenschaft und Frieden*, 1977. Pp. 30-42.

Weltöffentlichkeit und Friedenserziehung. In: Baumann, U., Lenhart, B. & Zimmerman, A. (Eds.) *Vergleichende Erziehungswissenschaft*, Erziehungswissenschaftliche Reihe, Bd. 22, Wiesbaden, 1981. Pp. 195-204.

Kritische Friedenserziehung – Thesen. In: Mallée, R. et al. (Eds.) *Lernziel Frieden: Eine Orientierungshilfe für die schulische und ausserschulische Bildungsarbeit*. Berlin: Ararat, 1982. Pp. 42-44.

Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Friedenserziehung. *Psychosozial*, 1985, (26), 8-17.

Peace education. In: Husén, T. & Postlethwaite, T.N. (Eds.) *The international enclyclopedia of education*. Oxford: Pergamon, 1985. Pp. 3813-3815.

Peace education. *Peace Education: An International Journal*, 1986, *10*, 13-15.

Friedenserziehung. In: Lenzen, D. (Ed.) *Pädagogische Grundbegriffe*, Bd. 1. Reinbek b. Hamburg: Rowohlt Taschenbuchverlag, 1989. Pp. 675-680.

Zum Wissenschaftsbegriff der Friedensforschung. In: *Schriften zur Friedens- und Konfliktforschung, Bd II*. Wien: VWGÖ, 1989. Pp. 360-363.

Education for peace. *Peace Education Miniprints* (Malmö, Sweden: School of Education), No. 28, 1992.

Internationale Erziehung und interkulturelles Lernen: UNESCO-Arbeit in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. *Erziehungswissenschaft* (Mitteilungsblatt der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Erziehungswissenschaft), 1992, *3*(6), 80-87.

ISSN 0479-7736